

Application Serial No.: 09/932,930  
Reply to Office Action dated June 11, 2003

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are presently active in this case, Claims 1 and 9 having been amended and Claims 17 and 18 having been added by way of the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim language objected to in Claim 1 has been deleted, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot. Additionally, Claim 9 has been amended to change the first occurrence of “the target object” to “a target object.” Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejections.

Claims 1-5, 9-11, and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) an obvious in view of Lzu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,183,189 B1). For the reasons discussed below, the Applicant requests the withdrawal of the art rejection.

The present application recites novel inventions that are different from the invention described in the Lzu et al. reference.

According to amended Claims 1-8 of the present application, (1) the transfer mechanism moves into the space between the table and the target object, and picks up the target object from below. In addition, in order to smooth the transfer mechanism’s movement to receive the target object, (2) the target object is inclined such that the transfer mechanism

Application Serial No.: 09/932,930  
Reply to Office Action dated June 11, 2003

approaching a side of the target object is higher than an opposite side. Additionally, a lower end of the target object is prevented from coming into contact with a surface of the table.

In contrast, unlike Claims 1-8 of the present application, the Lzu et al. references describes an apparatus for placing a wafer (10) at a predetermined position on a support table (20), not a method of transferring a wafer from a table. (See, e.g., column 2, lines 3-27, of the Lzu et al. reference.)

The Lzu et al. reference describes that after moving a wafer (10) over a support table (20)(Fig. 3), wafer lifting fingers (26, 27) receive and tilt the wafer, and put one end of the wafer on the support table (Fig. 4). Using the tilt of the wafer, the one end is brought into contact with banking pins (13, 14).

By the movements, the wafer is placed on the support table (20) at position that causes the wafer to be contact with the banking pins (13, 14).

The present invention advantageously lifts the target object from the table to a position such that the object is inclined in the manner recited to allow the transfer mechanism to pick up the object from below. The method recited in Claim 1 is not disclosed or even suggested by the Lzu et al. reference.

Similarly, Claims 9, 10-16, 17 and 18 of the present application relate to mechanisms or methods for transferring a target object from a table. Unlike Lzu et al., the claims do not recite an apparatus for placing a wafer at a predetermined position on a support table.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the art rejection.

Application Serial No.: 09/932,930  
Reply to Office Action dated June 11, 2003

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Attorney of Record

Christopher D. Ward  
Registration No. 41,367

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

GJM:CDW:brf  
I:\atty\cdw\213039US2\am1.doc